

Remarks

The undersigned apologizes for the clerical errors in the previous response.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present U.S. Patent application as amended herein in this response and request for continued examination.

Claim Objections

Regarding Action ¶6-7, Applicants apologize for the clerical error and have made the appropriate corrections to Claims 32 and 33.

§101

Regarding Action ¶8-10, Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's conclusion that the term "machine-readable media" is not limited to statutory subject matter. Applicants have, however, amended claims 31-42 to instead recite " machine-accessible media," and to remove the reference to "associated" to clarify that the claimed subject matter is, in fact, supported by the specification as that term is defined on page 18 of the specification of the application, and as is known in the art.

§112

Regarding Action ¶11-17, claims 8, 10, 23 and 31-42 have been amended to clarify the subject matter which applicants claim as their invention.

§102

Regarding Action ¶18-27, Claims 1-3 and 21-24 remain rejected under §102 as being anticipated by Goldberg (WO 02/03217). Applicants respectfully disagree, and request that the rejection be reconsidered in light of the clarifying amendments to Claims 1 and 21-24. In particular the subject matter of Claim 6 that was previously

indicated as being allowable has been restored in Claim 1, into which the limitations of Claim 6 have been incorporated.

Among other clarifying limitations, Claim 21 was amended to replace references to a “first” endpoint with an “internal” endpoint, and references to a “second” endpoint with an “external” endpoint in order to avoid confusion with the references to a “first” and “second” sessions. Applicants believe this change in language clarifies the difference between the routable network address for the external endpoint and the non-routable address for the internal endpoint and distinguishes over Goldberg. In particular, Applicants submit that the Examiner’s reliance on Fig. 12 and Page 20, Lines 2-10 is misplaced. If anything, Fig. 12 shows only a conventional protocol for communicating between a device that is behind a NAT and other devices, and not the recited limitations of a method for a registration server to facilitate communicating between such devices.

§103

Regarding Action ¶28-31, Claims 5 and 8 remain rejected under **§103** over Goldberg in view of Fallentine (US 2002/0042832). Applicants have amended Claim 1 from which Claim 5 depends, as well as Claim 8, in order to clarify the subject matter with applicants claim as their invention. Accordingly, Applicants request that the Examiner reconsider the rejection in light of the clarifying amendments. In particular, Claim 8 has been amended to recite receiving from the first endpoint an acknowledgement of the session initiation; and forwarding the acknowledgement to the second endpoint, so that the second endpoint can determine that the embedded network address in the acknowledgement is not routable (i.e., to confirm that it has been

translated by the NAT), and if so, to commence waiting for data to be sent to the second endpoint from the first endpoint through the NAT.

Regarding the rejection of other dependent claims not addressed above, these are deemed allowable for at least the reason as depending from allowable base claims, hence the technical merits of their claim rejections is not being addressed at this time.

Conclusion

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the outstanding rejections of all of the pending claims have been overcome. Therefore, Applicants further submit that Claims 1-5, 7, 8, 10, and 31-42 are now in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the present application. Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account number 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 19, 2006

/Donna Jo Coningsby /
Donna Jo Coningsby
Reg. No.: 41, 684

Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman, LLP
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(503) 439-8778